

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

HOUSAM YOUGHIF ABOUSAMRA,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:21-cv-12918

v.

Honorable Thomas L. Ludington
United States District Judge

KOLOLO KIJAKAZI,
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Honorable David R. Grand
United States Magistrate Judge

Defendant.

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DISMISSING COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE**

Plaintiff Housam Youffif Abousamra brings this case under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and § 1383(c)(3) for a review of the Acting Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of his applications for Supplemental Security Disability Insurance. ECF No. 1.

Now before this Court is Plaintiff’s objection, ECF No. 23, to Magistrate Judge David R. Grand’s Report and Recommendation (R&R), which recommends that Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment be denied, that Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment be granted, and that the Commissioner’s decision be affirmed, ECF No. 22 at PageID.1710–11.

When a party objects to an R&R, the court must review *de novo* those portions of the R&R to which Plaintiff has objected. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). To that end, the court must review at least the evidence that was before the magistrate judge. *See Hill v. Duriron Co.*, 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981). After reviewing the evidence, the court may accept, reject, or modify the magistrate judge’s findings or recommendations. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3); *Peek v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 585 F.Supp.3d 1014, 1017–18 (E.D. Mich. 2021). If the court will adopt the R&R, then it may simply “state that it engaged in a *de novo* review of the record and

adopts the [R&R]” without “stat[ing] with specificity what it reviewed.” *United States v. Robinson*, 366 F. Supp. 2d 498, 505 (E.D. Mich. 2005) (first citing *Lardie v. Birkett*, 221 F. Supp. 2d 806, 807 (E.D. Mich. 2002); and then citing 12 CHARLES A. WRIGHT ET AL., FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3070.2 (2d ed. 1997)), *aff’d*, 290 F. App’x 769 (6th Cir. 2008); *e.g.*, *Hereford v. Warren*, 486 F. Supp. 2d 659, 660–61 (E.D. Mich. 2007), *rev’d and remanded on other grounds*, 536 F.3d 523 (6th Cir. 2008).

This Court has reviewed Judge Grand’s R&R, Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment, Plaintiff’s objection, the ALJ’s decision, and all other applicable filings. Having conducted this *de novo* review, this Court concludes that Judge Grand’s factual conclusions are correct and that his legal reasoning sound.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Objection, ECF No. 23, is **OVERRULED**.

Further, it is **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 22, is **ADOPTED**.

Further, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 15, is **DENIED**.

Further, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 18, is **GRANTED**.

Further, it is **ORDERED** that the Acting Commissioner’s Order is **AFFIRMED**.

Further, it is **ORDERED** that the Complaint, ECF No. 1, is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

Dated: February 14, 2023

s/Thomas L. Ludington
THOMAS L. LUDINGTON
United States District Judge